

DELETED

From: MLMBlonde
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/12/03 11:27PM
Subject: Attention Jonathon Adelsetin

PLEASE vote "NO" on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act

Regards
Diane Walker

From: needmyjob
To: Cornmissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/13/03 12 54AM
Subject: Comments to the Cornmissioner

ATTENTION: FILED

9
16-32

needmyjob (thecrawford@netzero.net) writes

Are you "experts" going to "regulate" this industry in even further demise? America's prize industry "regulated" into crap. Wake up. The ILEC's need relief from the parasite CLEC's. If the Big Boys don't make it, nobody makes it, genius.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 163.179.1.120
Remote IP address: 163.179.1.120

From: Allen Hines
To: Mike Powell
Date: 11/13/03 9:27AM
Subject: 1996 Telecom act

Dear Chairman Powell.

If you have any sense you will not allow the Bell companies to cripple our economy with their strangle hold on the last mile. Vote NO to changes in the 1996 Telco act.

In the area where I live, not even voice mail is available because Verizon refuses to update the switch at the central office in Rye Beach.

I live in New Hampshire. It's the 27th fastest growing state in the U.S. and Rockingham County is the fastest growing county in the state. People are refusing to locate businesses here because they cannot get the telecom services they need.

Make the Bell companies compete. Monopoly is bad for the country and very bad for your grandchildren.

Sincerely,

E. Allen Hines
603-964-8689

CC: kbernat@fcc.gov

From: Allen Hines
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 11/13/03 9:36AM
Subject: Fwd: 1996 Telecom act:

TO: KATHLEEN ABERNATHY

9/6/03

Note. forwarded message attached

NOT FOR LATE FILE

2/2

From: Allen Hines
To: KM KJMWEB
cc: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Fwd: 1996 Telecom act

Note: forwarded message attached

EX-96-201-001 LAR 0010

96-92

From Allen Hines
To Mike Powell
cc kbern@fcc.gov
Subject 1996 Telecom act

Dear Chairman Powell

If you have any sense you will not allow the Bell companies to cripple our economy with their strangle hold on the last mile. Vote NO to changes in the 1996 Telco act

In the area where I live not even voice mail is available because Verizon refuses to update the switch at the central office in Rye Beach

I live in New Hampshire its the 27th fastest growing state in the U.S. and Rockingham County is the fastest growing county in the state. People are refusing to locate businesses here because they cannot get the telecom services they need

1-2-96

Make the Bell companies compete. Monopoly is bad for the country and very bad for your grandchildren

Sincerely

E. Allen Hines
603-964-8689

From: ELECTNV@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/13/03 11:45AM
Subject: Telco Act of 1996

RECEIVED

27 2003

EX-124, 125-001 ARE FILED
JAN 14 2003

Dear Chairman Powell

As a small business owner and reseller of long distance services, I'm hoping that you and your colleagues will not redefine the Telco Act of 1996

By going back to the times prior to the Act, your redefinition would without question cause many companies to go out of business. While we provide service to only a few thousand residential and business customers, we have put our growth plans on hold until we see the outcome of your decision.

Please leave the Telco Act of 1996 as is

Regards

Jerry L. Dorchuck
Chairman/CEO
Nationwide Long Distance, Inc

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein

From: gmittell
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/13/03 12:45PM
Subject: changes to the 1996 Telco Act

96-98

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

BY PAUSE OR LATE HIGH

I would like to urge you to vote "NO" on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act

I enjoy low telephone rates now and my wages do not keep up with taxes and everything else that continues to go higher

Sincerely

Gregory G Mitchell
47445 Sugarbush Rd
New Baltimore, MI 48047

From: gmittell
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 11/13/03 12:48PM
Subject: changes to the 1996 Telco Act

96-98
Am 2

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

I would like to urge you to vote "NO" on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act.

I enjoy low telephone rates now and my wages do not keep up with taxes and everything else that continues to go higher

Sincerely,

Gregory G Mitchell
47445 Sugarbush Rd
New Baltimore, MI 48047

From: Jim Cunningham
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/13/03 2:39PM
Subject: Proposed changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act

96-98

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I believe it is in the best interest of free enterprise, consumers and our American way of life for you to vote "no" on the proposed changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act. At no time, but especially in a down-turned economy, do Americans need additional liabilities added to their current balance sheets.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Respectfully,

James H. Cunningham, Jr.
Indoff Branch Partner, Las Vegas
1721 E. Mesquite Avenue 89101
702-471-0332 Fax 702-471-0830
james127@juno.com

From: Jim Cunningham
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 1/13/03 3:39 PM
Subject: Proposed changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I believe it is in the best interest of free enterprise, consumers and our American way of life for you to vote "no" on the proposed changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act. At no time, but especially in a down-turned economy, do Americans need additional liabilities added to their current balance sheets.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Respectfully,

James H. Cunningham, Jr.
Indoff Branch Partner, Las Vegas
1721 E. Mesquite Avenue 89101
702-471-0332 Fax 702-471-0830
jamesl27@juno.com

From: Nora Smith
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 11/13/03 8:02PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Nora Smith (Artlover47@aol.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 must be ammended to revise this 'giveaway policy' to Competitive Local Exchange Carriers. These Companies add nothing to this Country's GDP, provide little to no emmloyment opportunities to this Country, but only hinder the RBOCs that provide gainful employment and make significant capital investments to help the economy.

This is *not* the kind of industry where the shallow pockets of CLECs belong

Would I be allowed to purchase Delta airline tickets at and below their cost and resell these tickets for a profits That is exactly what this 1996 Act is doing! It is distroying the RBOCs as viable businesses; making capital investments-Lucient Technology and numerous other companies are already exhibiting the results of the 1996 Act.

I am sure you will act favorably on this dire situation

Thank You

Nora Smith
Centerville, MA

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 205.188.209.76
Remote IP address: 205.188.209.76

From: gw@devoar.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/14/03 9:22AM
Subject: Please vote "NO" on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act.

76 78

Please vote "NO" on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act.

Thank you

600-684-4444

Gale DeVoar Sr
6214 Carew St
Houston TX 77074
USA
Phone. 713-771-6001
E-mail Address. <mailto:gw@devoar.com>
Web Page <http://www.devoar.com/>

From: James Rusconi
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/14/03 3 51PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

96-98

James Rusconi (manicotti63@hotmail.com) writes

I urge you to maintain local phone service competition. Let the states individually determine wholesale rates for access to the Bell networks. Competition, states rights and consumer interests need to prevail.

I urge you not to cave in the Bell lobbying pressure

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.78.43 175
Remote IP address: 209.78.43 175

RECORDED COPY

From: Brian Underdahl
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/15/03 11:58AM
Subject: I oppose granting SBC long distance rights in Nevada

Dear Chairman Powell;

I am sending you this message to register my opposition to the FCC granting SBC permission to offer long distance service in the state of Nevada. Although their filing included many reasons why SBC feels they should be granted this permission, I feel that there are good reasons why this permission should not be granted under the current conditions.

My primary opposition to the SBC request stems from their clearly uncompetitive behavior in their treatment of customers even a short distance outside of major metropolitan areas. My circumstance provides an excellent example.

I believe that it has been a stated goal of the FCC and the Federal Government to insure that broadband Internet access become available for as many Americans as possible. SBC is not fulfilling their responsibility in this regard.

We live in Storey County, Nevada, about half way between Reno and Virginia City in an area known as the Virginia City Highlands. There are many high-tech knowledge workers in this area, and we have repeatedly informed SBC of our desire for DSL Internet access. In fact, they have had a list of at least several dozen people in our area who have tried to place orders for DSL service over the past several years. The response from SBC is simply "we don't have any immediate plans to serve the area."

SBC is quite happy to provide me with ISDN service. It is slow, expensive, and metered--especially compared to DSL. When I requested ISDN SBC informed me that the service was available since I was "less than 18,000 feet" from the central office. But somehow when I ask for DSL I am suddenly "over 45,000 feet" from the central office. Funny, I don't remember moving our house during that time.

We have asked SBC to provide a remote DSLAM to service this area, but they don't respond. We have asked when they intend to service the clear demand for DSL in our area, but they don't have a response.

I believe that granting SBC permission to provide long distance service in Nevada will eliminate what little incentive there is for SBC to provide broadband access to the Nevada residents who don't live within the currently served areas. I would hope that the FCC would consider the needs of these people and withhold that permission until SBC provides the answers and service we desire.

Thank you

Brian Underdahl, Author
Underdahl Computing
210 Vermillion Road
VC Highlands

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: 11/15/03 5:22PM
Subject: Fwd: FW: Vote no on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act

EX PARTY OF LATE FILED

36.98

11/15/03

From: conrad.j.odenthal@exgate.tek.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 1/15/03 5:22PM
Subject: FW: Vote no on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act

EX-PAUSE ON LATE FEB. 15

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear Madam

I urge you to Vote no on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act.

Thanks

Conrad Odenthal
25575 SW Labrousse Rd
Sherwood, OR 97140

From: conrad.j.odenthal@exgate tek com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/15/03 5:25PM
Subject: FW: Vote no on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act

Commissioner Jonathan S Adelstein:

Dear sir

I urge you to Vote no on the planned changes to the 1996 Telco Act.

Thanks,

Conrad Odenthal
25575 SW Labrousse Rd
Sherwood, OR 97140

From: the.mom1@juno.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 1/16/03 12:08AM
Subject: Changes to 1996 Telecom Act

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED 96-98

Dear FCC Commissioner Abernathy,

Please do not enact any increases to long distance telephone rates which would up the cost of phone service for the individual homeowner.

In the past few years, many of the telephone companies have increased their rates significantly. In some cases they only offer a package of services; they do not have an affordable, single line, basic use option.

In a sluggish economy, those of us at the bottom of the food chain have a hard time trying to make ends meet. To raise the cost of phone service would be just another slap in the face to this segment of our society.

Further, most of the public schools in my state require their students to use the Internet in a variety of school assignments or projects. By raising the rates, you only increase the financial burden on families with school-age children.

If all the telephone service companies cannot make ends meet, they should look inward to verify that salaries at the executive level are not outrageously excessive (as in the past), or that they have not pushed too hastily into other markets which are draining money away from their core business: local telephone service.

While competition is supposed to keep prices down to a reasonable level, too many companies of late have tried to make a big killing for themselves by jacking up the costs -- legally or illegally. As a result, the "little guy" foots the bill.

Three years ago, I could get a service plan for a \$20.00 monthly fee plus 2 cents per minute for all my long distance calls. It was affordable for a senior citizen. Most of the new plans bundle several services together, whether one wants them or not. This is good for the telephone companies' bottom line, but expensive to the individual user.

Again, please do not increase the rates on telephone service.

Sincerely,

J. M. Stevenson
(the.mom1@juno.com)

From: the mom1@juno.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/16/03 12 08AM
Subject: Changes to 1996 Telecom Act

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

Please do not enact any increases to long distance telephone rates which would up the cost of phone service for the individual homeowner.

In the past few years, many of the telephone companies have increased their rates significantly. In some cases they only offer a package of services, they do not have an affordable, single line, basic use option

In a sluggish economy, those of us at the bottom of the food chain have a hard time trying to make ends meet. To raise the cost of phone service would be just another slap in the face to this segment of our society.

Further, most of the public schools in my state require their students to use the Internet in a variety of school assignments or projects. By raising the rates you only increase the financial burden on families with school-age children.

If all the telephone service companies cannot make ends meet, they should look inward to verify that salaries at the executive level are not outrageously excessive (as in the past), or that they have not pushed too hastily into other markets which are draining money away from their core business local telephone service

While competition is supposed to keep prices down to a reasonable level, too many companies of late have tried to make a big killing for themselves by jacking up the costs -- legally or illegally. As a result, the "little guy" foots the bill

Three years ago, I could get a service plan for a \$20.00 monthly fee plus 2 cents per minute for all my long distance calls. It was affordable for a senior citizen. Most of the new plans bundle several services together, whether one wants them or not. This is good for the telephone companies bottom line, but expensive to the individual user.

Again, please do not increase the rates on telephone service

Sincerely,

J M Stevenson
(the mom1@juno.com)

From: queenbivi3@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 11/17/03 12:21PM
Subject: FCC action threatens telecommunications competition

RECEIVED FOR LATE FILED

11/17/03

Commissioner Johnathan Adelstein, Commissioner

Dear Commissioner Johnathan Adelstein

I am a small business owner who believes that competition in the telecommunications market is an attainable and intelligent goal. With this in mind I respectfully ask the Federal Communications Commission to uphold the 1996 Telecommunications Act and protect competition in the local telecommunications market

The time has come for the triennial review of rules governing the utilization of the unbundled network elements platform (UNE-P) created to introduce competition into local telecom markets. The logic of the UNE-P system was that it is unreasonable to assume that competitors to existing regional bell operating companies could build networks of similar scope without the benefits of government sanctioned monopoly.

As 2003 begins, it is now empirically clear that the UNE-P system, as it currently exists, benefits small businesses by encouraging competition for their business in the local telecommunications market. Competition brings lower prices, more attentive customer service and more service options.

A move to abandon the UNE-P system and ignore the sentiments of state public utility commissions would reverse gains in competition. As you know, UNE-P prices set by the TELRIC system take into account both the cost of building and maintaining current systems as well as a cost of capital of around 11.25%. These calculations coupled with RBOCs' entrance into the lucrative long distance market give little credence to Bell companies' professed woes.

Your choice seems clear, either continue on the path of telecommunications competition that is finally bearing fruit or abandon the market to a handful of local monopolies. I urge you to choose competition and continue your support for the current UNE-P system.

Sincerely

Eugenia Bivines
7003 N. Baltimore Ave

Kansas City, MO 64118

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: 1/17/03 12:21PM
Subject: Fwd: FCC action threatens telecommunications competition

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

2-16-03

From: queenbivi3@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 1/17/03 12 21PM
Subject: FCC action threatens telecommunications competition

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

3-1-03

Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner

Dear Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy

I am a small business owner who believes that competition in the telecommunications market is an attainable and intelligent goal. With this in mind I respectfully ask the Federal Communications Commission to uphold the 1996 Telecommunications Act and protect competition in the local telecommunications market

The time has come for the triennial review of rules governing the utilization of the unbundled network elements platform (UNE-P) created to introduce competition into local telecom markets. The logic of the UNE-P system was that it is unreasonable to assume that competitors to existing regional bell operating companies could build networks of similar scope without the benefits of government sanctioned monopoly.

As 2003 begins, it is now empirically clear that the UNE-P system, as it currently exists, benefits small businesses by encouraging competition for their business in the local telecommunications market. Competition brings lower prices, more attentive customer service and more service options

A move to abandon the UNE-P system and ignore the sentiments of state public utility commissions would reverse gains in competition. As you know, UNE-P prices set by the TELRIC system take into account both the cost of building and maintaining current systems as well as a cost of capital of around 11.25%. These calculations coupled with RBOCs entrance into the lucrative long distance market give little credence to Bell companies professed woes.

Your choice seems clear, either continue on the path of telecommunications competition that is finally bearing fruit or abandon the market to a handful of local monopolies. I urge you to choose competition and continue your support for the current UNE-P system.

Sincerely,

Eugenia Bivines
7003 N Baltimore Ave

Kansas City, MO 64118

EX PARTIAL OR LATE FILE

From: Precursor Group - Scott Cleland
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/21/03 4:03PM
Subject: UNE-P R I P -- Why the Demise of UNE-P Matters So Much to Investors

Summary. Precursor strongly believes that the FCC will effectively kill UNE-P as a growth segment, most likely at the February 13th FCC meeting. This FCC decision represents one of the most important predictable, and positive telecom events in 2003. Precursor strongly advises investors that this decision will positively affect companies comprising over 90% of the total market cap in telecom services and telecom equipment (VZ, SBC, BLS, Q, AT, CTL, LU, NT, CSCO, ALA, GLW), and will be a negative for ATBT, WorldCom bonds, and the CLECs. Precursor cautions investors not to be misled by backward-looking analysis that says UNE-P is not changing much and does not matter. Such analysis erroneously assumes that future regulation will be just like the past, even though the courts have struck down the FCC's entire unbundling framework, and there's a Republican FCC majority revising the 1996 Telecom Act rules for the first time. Why does the demise of UNE-P matter to investors? It's a precondition for telecom fundamentals to improve and for telecom to recover in 2003, it abruptly ends extraordinary UNE-P arbitrage growth: it's a "pivot point" for capex; it has a near perfect investment cleave, and it ends the de facto government policy of propping up ATBT and WorldCom. (The full research can be accessed by viewing the attached PDF file.)

Registered Clients visit Precursor Research Archives Forgotten your password? Email websupport@precursorgroup.com or call Daniel Pfenenger at (202) 828-7823

Scott C. Cleland, CEO
The Precursor Group
202-828-7800 phone
202-828-7801 fax
scleland@precursorgroup.com

If you would prefer not to receive further messages from this sender please click on the following e-mail link and send a message with or without any text

[Click here for e-mail](#)

You will receive one additional e-mail message confirming your removal